SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJPAS_56675**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Backward Doubly SDEs with weak Monotonicity and General Growth Generators**
Type of the Article	**Original Research Article**

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline)

<mark>PART 1:</mark> Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	- (H.1), (H.2) in text, what is a.e, a.s.? explain first, then use throughout text. Also scrutinize the way you write equation. Make sure full stop or comma in the right place. Ex. In (H.1): $z \in R^{kxd}$, $y \to f(w; t; y; z)$ is continuous. - Lipschitz throughout the text. L capital - In (H.3), define what is ' stands for - No references where you get your assumptions from - Should include Ito, Young and other inequalities that you use when deriving the formulation. Easier to read. - A lot of typo throughout the text, and some full stop not in its intended places. Should consider proofreading. - No conclusion - Reduce originality to below 30%. Currently at 46%	Revision amended\ Done Corrected Made revision
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	- The structure of the sentences can be improved for easier read.	

<mark>PART 2:</mark>

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment *(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	